

## REMARKS

The objection to claim 26 is not understood. The phrase "said non-radio frequency network" in the third line of claim 26 has antecedent basis in the same clause used in the second line of claim 26. Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 was rejected over the combination of Cannon in view of Flint.

However, claim 1 calls for appending packetized non-voice data to voice data transmitted between said first and second telephones. It is suggested that this is taught in Flint. But all Flint says in the cited material is that both data and voice can be communicated between the handheld and base units simultaneously. See column 3, lines 5 and 6. All this refers to is that the computer 304 and the base unit 302 can talk to one another. It may simply mean that voice can be sent one way and data can be sent the other way.

Nothing in the reference in any way indicates that the packetized non-voice data is appended to voice data. Instead, it appears that two separate systems are used for voice and data. In any case, nothing indicates that packetized non-voice data is appended to voice data.


Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Because the combination of the cited references, even if they were properly combinable, does not meet the limitations of the claim, a *prima facie* rejection is not made out.

In view of these remarks, the application should now be in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 19, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy M. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]